

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/502,045	Applicant(s) KUDO ET AL.	
	Examiner NATASHA YOUNG	Art Unit 1797	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NATASHA YOUNG. (3) AKIHIRO YAMAZAKI.

(2) WALTER GRIFFIN. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 10 December 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 4.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ito et al (EP 361883 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ito et al reference was discussed. Applicant argues that the honeycomb structure of Ito et al is different from the claimed invention because the foaming agent of Ito et al is used to adjust the thermal expansion of the honeycomb structure and foaming agent of the claimed invention is used to adjust the thermal capacity of the honeycomb structure resulting in different honeycomb structures.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.